In this world never is enmity appeased by hatred; enmity is ever appeased by Love. This is the Law Eternal. —*The Dhammapada*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 55 JULY, 1967 NUMBER 9

THE SECRET DOCTRINE

The time must presently come when the really advanced thinkers of the age will be compelled to lay by their indifference, and their scorn and conceit, and follow the lines of philosophical investigation laid down in the *Secret Doctrine*. Very few seem yet to have realized how ample are these resources, because it involves a process of thought almost unknown to the present age of empiricism and induction. It is a revelation from archaic ages, indestructible and eternal, yet capable of being obscured and lost; capable of being again and again reborn, or like man himself—reincarnated.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

No one styling himself a "scholar," in whatever department of exact science, will be permitted to regard these teachings seriously. They will be derided and rejected *a priori* in this century; but only in this one. For in the twentieth century of our era scholars will begin to recognize that the *Secret Doctrine* has neither been invented nor exaggerated, but, on the contrary, simply outlined; and finally, that its teachings antedate the Vedas.

H. P. BLAVATSKY

THESE are guidelines provided to those who accept H. P. Blavatsky as the teacher of Theosophy. In the light of what is said by both Mr. Judge and H.P.B., a particular importance attaches to the form in which this teaching is embodied. For, unquestionably, the Wisdom-Religion has taken many forms, down through the ages. One can select for study a particular example of these forms, or, if he has the time and the ability, he may try to study them all. For those who go in these directions, the problem

is, on the one hand, to avoid becoming a sectarian, and, on the other, to reach through the forms to the substance which lies beneath.

There is a sense in which H.P.B. was an eclectic. She used the full spectrum of materials afforded by the historical record of past science, philosophy, and religion, and she drew also on records said to be inaccessible to modern scholarship. Yet when she borrowed from Montaigne for the measure of her contribution—"I HAVE HERE MADE ONLY A NOSEGAY OF CULLED FLOWERS, AND HAVE BROUGHT NOTHING OF MY OWN BUT THE STRING THAT TIES THEM" —she did not explain the importance of that "string," which put the Wisdom-Religion into a conceptual language affording the human race of her time the best possible opportunity for understanding its meaning. Her eclecticism, in short, was only apparent. Reading the works of H. P. Blavatsky is no antiquarian journey into the learning and wisdom of the past, but a direct contact with timeless philosophy in the thought-forms of the present age. H.P.B. was no child of her times, but she understood the needs of those who were.

This seems the most important single fact to be recognized about H.P.B. She, with her helpers, constructed a Theosophical curriculum out of intimate knowledge of the dynamics of soul-learning in the present cycle of man's evolution. This means that the proportion of principle to illustration and fact, of symbol to metaphysical doctrine, of hint and suggestion to explicit outline, occurs in her writings from understanding of man's nature and its present capacities for progress. This must have prevailed in everything that she did.

So, naturally, the question of "authority" requires attention. To speak in this way of the importance of recognizing H.P.B. as the teacher of Theosophy is, however, not to demand acceptance of her as a conventional authority, but rather to make us attentive to whatever she said concerning "authority." It is to suggest that, whatever she said, it is almost certain to have more pertinence and application to the study of Theosophy than anything anyone else has said. Such an "authority" uses the attentiveness of the student as a means of freeing him from any sort of authority, save his own understanding. What is the evidence for this? It lies in the works of those who have been most attentive to what she taught—in the writings, say, of William Q. Judge and Robert Crosbie. The minds of these two give evidence of a full, unhalting freedom of expression, of a cosmo-

politanism of thought which cleaves spontaneously to the essential lines of teaching found in the works of H.P.B. Thus we are returned to the prefatory statement about *The Secret Doctrine,* which "claims consideration, not by reason of any appeal to dogmatic authority, but because it closely adheres to Nature, and follows the laws of uniformity and analogy."

It follows that anything said of H.P.B.'s work, if it reflects her intentions, will point, finally, to the internal evidence of its value, and this applies to all the attitudes of faithfulness and devotion given expression by those who have found in her their guide, philosopher, and friend.

Those With Clear Vision

Always they come—the ones with the vision, the faith, the profound understanding of what makes men human and keeps them so. Always they remind us that we must not only tolerate one another's differences, we must treasure them; for out of these differences come the unpredictable, the new idea, the bright dream, the strange and wondrous gift. When times grow dark, when we persecute or hide away from others because of our fears, these few turn the lights on again with their words. Whether they speak in the name of religion, science, or common decency, their concern causes miracles to happen: men begin to lose their fear, they find things to do, they discover within themselves potentialities they did not know they possessed; and, making use of them, they move the human race up a little—a few inches, at least—to a higher level of feeling and doing, learning and becoming.

Whatever lies ahead in the human future is there because men—yesterday, today, a thousand or ten thousand years ago—have had a vision of what our world can become and shared their vision with us. It is a good thing to remember that never have all the lights gone out, no matter how confused and bewildered an age we live in. Always there have been those whose vision stayed clear.

—Lillian Smith: *Now is the Time*

ACQUIRED HABITS

IN attempting to deal with problems which only find their solution worked out to the full on planes and in terms incomprehensible to our ordinary senses, it would seem possible that illustrations drawn from the science of physiology should serve to explain these problems somewhat more fully than those illustrations which are drawn from physical science alone. Physiology is at least the science of life, and though, when pressed, we must admit that we know very little indeed of the main factors which lie behind the phenomena of life, and that, with all the means of research which we possess, we know nothing of even the physical forces *in themselves,* but only study their manifestations and correlations, yet we may, at all events, argue from the little we do know, and attempt to correct our conclusions by comparison with the analogies which we can draw from every science.

The principle involved in the "as above, so below," is shown to be true in all departments of science, and has formed a most valuable means of verifying the results obtained by pushing a theory to its legitimate conclusion. Thus by correcting the phenomena of vital force by those of physical, we may arrive at many more or less just conclusions. Therefore, it is probable that by proceeding a step further, and drawing analogies from physiology, we may form an idea of what, for want of a better term, may be called the life of morality, and the forces whereby it is governed.

By the term moral, I do not mean to convey any idea of that which underlies what is ordinarily known as morality, but a very much wider idea than that, namely, the force which really lies at the base of and inspires all our *motives* of action. Of course these are indirectly also at the root of our physical and what may be called our animate life, in which we men are in contact with the life of animals; but at present we need not endeavour to make a distinction between man and the animals, which are endowed with the physical

---

NOTE.—This article was published by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for May, 1888.

and animate life force, but in whom the moral life is entirely latent, save in the case of a very few of the higher species, such as dogs and elephants. Though, even in these cases, it may be argued with good show of reason that this "moral life" of the higher animals is the result of education.

Now in man and animal alike there are great nervous centres which govern the vital phenomena, and hence, as a consequence, the physical phenomena of life. These centers, as they are called, are formed by collections of nerve cells, which occupy a very fairly defined area. They are found in the brain and the spinal cord for the most part, and to a lesser degree in the great vital organs themselves. Further, there is what is known as the sympathetic system of nerves, with its closely meshed network of nerves and ganglia, which lies outside, but in front of, the vertebral column, the whole length of the body; this system is closely connected in its whole extent with the brain and spinal cord, and the branches therefrom, which are known as the cerebro-spinal system of nerves. Again to some extent the control of the nerves lies with the Will of any man, and the actions which result are termed "voluntary," but a very large majority of the processes and functions of the animal body are what are called "reflex."

These "reflex" processes for the most part take place thus: An impression is made on what are called the nerves of sensation; these conduct a stimulus to one of the nerve centres above mentioned, and from this centre the stimulus is reflected along a motor nerve, and the action or function ensues. Thus the sensation is "reflected" into motion independently of the consciousness of the individual. Perhaps the best example of a limited reflection is in the case of the eye, when, in response to the stimulus or light, the iris alone, of all the muscles in the body, moves. Now all reflex actions are essentially involuntary, although they in great part admit of being controlled, modified, and prevented by the will. They, most of them, are directed for the preservation of the well-being of the body, and markedly show how the nerve centres combine and arrange in order the action of the muscles, so that they may unite for this common end.

Among "reflex" actions there is a large class called "secondary," which require for their first performance, and for many subsequent performances, an effort of the will more or less intense, but which, by constant repetition, are habitually and almost mechanically per-

formed, and in many cases almost without the intervention of consciousness and volition: such are reading, writing, and walking. This capacity of the nervous system, which consists in "organising conscious actions into more or less unconscious ones," is that which makes education and training possible. It is by "association" of the reflex actions frequently repeated in a definite order that these actions come to take on a species of "automation." To such an extent is this carried that we are all familiar with instances of persons, when in the somnambulic condition, writing and playing the piano in a state of complete unconsciousness to physical surroundings.

In fact "automatism" is a very important point in the argument. It is employed by physiologists to indicate the origination in nervous centres of impulses and their conduction from those centres independently of the reception of a stimulus from another part. And in this sense it is not possible in the present state of physiological knowledge to say what actions are "automatic." But the nearest examples are certainly the functions of respiration and the rhythmic action of the heart, which will be considered later on. Suffice it at present that it is a very important point that actions, which are distinctly reflex at the beginning, may be organised into unconscious actions which have a very strong character about them of automatism, and that the two above-mentioned functions are those which are at the foundation of all vital phenomena, and hence, by the passage of time and by education, would necessarily most nearly approach to being automatic.

We may now consider the sympathetic system of nerves. This system of nerves at first sight appears to be anatomically too complex to be understood. In reality, however, it is much more simple in arrangement than the cerebro-spinal, and its complexity is due to the manner in which each part is linked to the neighbouring and distant parts and to the cerebro-spinal system as well. When dissected out it is found that the essential parts of this system consist of a ganglion, or nerve centre, and two nerves—afferent and efferent—leading to this centre, and from it to one of the organs. Thus the sympathetic system is made up of an enormous number of small systems, and the whole are united into the greatest complexity. But there is one essential difference between the two systems.

In the case of the cerebro-spinal system, the majority of the actions taking place under its guidance are voluntary actions; in the case of the sympathetic system, not only do the majority of actions

take place without a voluntary effort, but they are never controlled by the mind save under the strong excitement or depressing influence of some passion; or secondarily, through some "voluntary movement" with which the involuntary region of the body is "associated." But in the latter case the action is really involuntary. Thus, in exceptional instances only does the mind control the action of the sympathetic nerves, and then only under undue excitement or depression; while for the most part the various centres of the sympathetic system, and also of the spinal cord, are reflex centres, which, subject to the "inhibiting action" of the brain, or more highly-organised centre, possess an independent action of their own that, aided by custom, habit, and frequency of use, almost amounts to automatism.

In the consideration of automatism we find that there is a nervous region of very great importance situated at the top of the spinal cord and immediately below the brain, and which, roughly speaking, is just within the skull about an inch behind a line drawn horizontally through the lobe of the ear. This region is so important that it has been experimentally found that the entire brain and spinal cord with this sole exception may be removed and still the heart will continue to beat and the animal will go on breathing. But when this region is injured, death ensues at once. Now the most important of the functions of the Medulla Oblongata, as the region in question is called, is that of respiration, and this one function may serve as the type of automatic actions, although there is some dispute about it. Like all the functions which are necessary to life it is essentially involuntary, but its action is also, to some extent, under the control of the will, for otherwise man would be unable to speak or to sing. It is argued that the act is a reflex one owing to the stimulation of nervous fibres which are distributed to the lungs; on the other hand it is stated that respiration takes place by direct stimulation of the Medulla Oblongata by the increasingly venous condition of the blood. Probably both functions exist, but the nerves leading from the lungs to the "respiratory centre" may be cut or may be paralysed by chloroform, and still the complicated muscular movements which constitute respiration take place in an orderly manner.

As said above, respiration can to some extent be controlled by the will, and the breath can be "held" for a varying length of time which increases with practice. But the need of breath eventually overcomes the strongest opposition, and even the most determined

attempts to commit suicide in this manner have failed. Still there is no doubt that by practice persons have increased the time during which they can hold their breath, as in certain well-authenticated cases of suspended animation, which have occurred in various parts of the world and especially in India, and thus there is shown to be a power which may be exercised in control of the natural automatism of the body and which, so far as the bodily frame is concerned, is independent of it. Were this not the case the instances of sudden death which occur through shock, and without injury to any part of the body, would be impossible, for there is no reason why the functions of respiration and of the heart should be interfered with, and the body would go on breathing and the heart beating under the stimulus of the Medulla Oblongata.

Thus, then, it is this "organizing conscious actions into more or less unconscious ones," but which may still be under the control of some force that we may call the will, which is of the highest importance to the occultist, as will be seen later on. Speaking in terms of planes, it enables a man to do two or perhaps more things at the same time. Starting an original impulse to walk from point to point, a man may take the necessary steps with no other guidance than the reflected sensations of one step to make another, and during the time occupied his mind may be engaged on matters of a totally different character. But waiving these considerations and the assumption that the brain is physically a registering "organ of mind" it is evident that to a considerable extent the brain has the control of the body.

To those who have studied metaphysics the term "personality" is a very familiar one. In reference to the present subject it would seem to stand to the "higher self" in very much the same relation as the body does to the brain—or rather to the brain only as the organ of mind; that is to say that the personality is, on the moral plane referred to previously, the outer covering, more or less gross, of the real man within—the higher self. This latter is the gradually increasing product of ages and is added to by the "personality" only when it carries out the spiritual aspirations which arise beyond, but which are communicated to the personality by the higher self. Consequently we may compare the actions dictated by the personality to those physical ones which are governed by the lower reflex centres and which have no concern whatever with the brain.

And this brings into prominence a curious fact in physiology and

pathology that if either a nerve centre or nerve leading from that centre be stimulated without the impulse passing *to and through* that centre, the actions which result are tumultuous and disordered. This fact has a very important bearing by analogy on those actions which are dictated, reflexly or not, by the "personality" only, for, as regards the higher self or brain, they are found tumultuous and disorderly and are, as a rule, not "directed with a view to the welfare of the organism," and more especially of other organisms. It would be impossible to enter on an elaborate analysis of what the personality really is—and as tedious as if one were in these pages to enter on a detailed description of the minute anatomy of the brain and spinal cord. Man is a compound, in his personality, of "desires, passions, interests, modes of thinking and feeling, opinions, prejudices, judgments of others, likings and dislikings, affections, and ambitions, public and private." For the most part this personality constitutes the horizon of man, and identifies him with this narrowed circle of interests. In other words he becomes exceedingly "selfish." Of course, the circle is very frequently enlarged, as in the case of family, of a society, of a church, or a state, and other individuals esteem men in proportion as their circle enlarges.

Now the enlargement of the circle to and beyond these limits is a process of extreme difficulty, and especially when the circle is enlarged beyond these limits. But there is also another element which has to be eliminated—the thought of Self must not enter into the consideration at all. That is to say that the personality as a source of motive must be entirely eliminated and destroyed; and this is the process which occupies ages and is accompanied by such pain and suffering that it can only be faced by the aid of a consciousness of the higher self, and that this work is the only work worth doing. It is not very difficult to understand why this should be so difficult, and why it should take ages to accomplish, for we have to remember that it is the accentuation of personality against personality—the competition to live—which is at the base of all our modern education. In every age the strong man has kept his citadel against all comers until a stronger than he came, and the question is whether he can find a deeper and greater source of strength. To some extent that has been found, for "union is strength"; and the only problem has been amidst the clashing of personalities to make union possible. The parallel in physiology is seen in the difficulty, only obviated by long practice, experienced by divers in holding their breath.

Murder will out, respiration will recommence and the educated personality reasserts itself, as the body insists upon the breath it is accustomed to have.

But again it is possible for man to lay aside the limitations of his personality and merge his living interests with those of the world in which other personalities have an equal right and share. He can force himself to no longer feel separate from them, and to live in companionship with that which in them is beyond their personalities —their individualities, their Higher Selves. But this is a process which needs an enormous strength of will and an application to which most men are unequal. The ordinary senses have to be stilled and quieted before—if one may misapply a term—the sense of the higher self comes into play, and the divine companionship of the higher self is felt and realised.

Thus, then, the analogy of physiology is maintained: the bodily functions are reflexly fulfilled, and by long education, in some cases automatically, but are subject, in proportion as another education has trained the mind and will, to the brain. Equally so on the moral plane, the desires and tendencies of the personality act more or less reflexly and automatically without other control. But in proportion as the limitations of Self have been transcended, so also is the extent of the power increased which controls the personality. The brain in one case, the higher self in the other, being trained and educated to send down impulses sufficient to control the physiological needs of the animal mechanism, or the desires of the personality.

But a further and yet more interesting problem now presents itself for discussion. We have seen that it is rational to conclude that conscious acts are by education organized into unconscious, and that the two functions most important to the physiological health of the body, viz. respiration and the action of the heart, have been rendered automatic and independent almost of any voluntary conscious effort, although this control may be, in some instances, recovered. Consequently, by analogy, the control on the moral plane may be vested in the higher self as against the personality, by an effort to unite the consciousness with that higher self. That is, the higher self, or brain, will be able to control the physiological personality, or a higher centre dominate a lower. But a still further point would seem to consist in this. Why should it not be possible to make of the higher self a reflex centre, and finally an automatic

one, which shall control the personality absolutely? On the physiological analogy it would certainly seem reasonable that this should be so.

Let the personality send up a suggestion for action to the reflex centre, which may be in or below the level of the higher self, as is the case in the relative positions of the cerebral hemispheres and the Medulla Oblongata. Supposing that the motor point be in the higher self, it would only seem natural that the corresponding motion excited by the suggestion of the personality will either be in accord with the higher self, and be accomplished, or will be nullified. If, however, the motor point be below the higher self, then the communication must be handed on in order that the higher self shall have control, and the personality not allowed to exercise sway.

Finally, however, the real importance of the argument does not rest with the higher self, but with the spiritual life beyond; or, as *Light on the Path* states it, "the life beyond individuality."

Let us grant for the moment that it is possible for the consciousness to be identified with the higher self, and that the personality as militating against that better part of man, and consequently interfering with "the life beyond individuality," is entirely subjected and controlled by a centre of force, certainly reflex, and, if possible, automatic, which is vested in the higher self. What, then, is the consequence? The personality as a source of separateness is done away with, and only used as an instrument in the same way that the physical body uses a finger. The real life is centered in the higher self, which maintains an automatic action over the personality, and prevents it from becoming a source of mischief. The force which is vested in the higher self or individuality is derived from that united Spirit of Life which is beyond individuality, and the man is left free to concentrate his attention and aspirations on that Spirit of Life, and draw more and more of its influence through his higher self into the world around him. Just as the physiological needs of the body are controlled by an unconscious, involuntary mechanism, so the personality becomes a conquered instrument, used for ends greater than it knows of. Man, as man, is no longer swayed by his changing and temporary desires, and has reached the happy "Waters of Oblivion."

—A.I.R.

letters • questions • comment

In her preface to The Key To Theosophy, *H. P. Blavatsky observes that "to the mentally lazy or obtuse, Theosophy must remain a riddle; for in the world mental as in the world spiritual each man must progress by his own efforts." Yet students of Theosophy are often heard to declare that the basic ideas of the philosophy are simple and easy to grasp, that their truth is, in fact, self-evident. Why, then, does H.P.B. indicate otherwise?*

Perhaps the only time that Theosophy seems "simple" is when one is first introduced to its concepts, and intuitively recognizes their verity. This recognition is sometimes mistaken for knowledge; if so, the satisfaction engendered may prevent further inquiry. Does this indicate that one is mentally lazy or obtuse? It may, indeed, if the mood is prolonged.

Even so simple and apparently forthright a statement as the one quoted—Theosophy must remain a riddle to the mentally lazy or obtuse—will become suggestive if carefully re-read. What, for example, does H.P.B. mean here by Theosophy? Its tenets and doctrines? Its fundamental propositions simply stated? Hardly; for it is from the feeling of understanding the inherent truth of these ideas that the delusion of knowledge may arise—the feeling that one knows "what Theosophy *is*." But Theosophy so considered is not a riddle; it is that part of the "ocean of knowledge" that will not overwhelm the understanding of a child. The riddle is posed by the depth, the ramifying dimensions of these initially simple ideas. And why "riddle"? Why not enigma? Might it perhaps be to suggest that a person who is mentally lazy will be satisfied with *guessing* what a statement means, instead of searching beneath and beyond the words for further implications? (The obtuse, of course, will not be aware that deeper or subtler meanings underlie the printed words.) H.P.B. makes another point by comparing the mental and spiritual worlds, instead of the mental and physical, where we have learned by experience that effort has to be made if we are to advance toward our goal. By assuming we realize the necessity for effort

if spiritual progress is to be made, she highlights its importance.

The person who thinks that he who runs may read might be likened to one who, having learned the rules of a game, thinks he is ready to play the game. But let him enter into active contest, and he will find that knowledge of the rules is only the beginning. Unforeseen circumstances arise, an opponent does not act as expected, and the contestant finds it necessary to shift his ground, to re-evaluate his position, to devise new strategy, while all the time remembering the rules limiting his procedure.

Is Karma a simple idea? The sequence of cause and effect as universal Law in operation finds ready assent, and we find assurance in the thought that causes lie behind all events, in reinforcement of the idea that this is a rational, as opposed to a chaotic, world in which we live. But there are those to whom it seems sufficient just to say, "it's Karma," when confronted with a world of contradictions and injustice. This seems to them explanation enough, and they are fortified by the thought that there *must* always be a reason, however obscure. The person who stops thinking at this point might well be considered mentally lazy. It is the one who continues his search for the cause, and the cause behind *that* "cause," who is headed toward progress. Being familiar with the concept of Karma is an immeasurable help, but only if applications are made. Theosophy is not a static philosophy. It is not a dogma, though a closed mind can make it seem dogmatic. In reality, acquaintance with the doctrine of Karma is familiarity with an abstract *principle,* whereas the application of that principle is part of the process of living.

To say that there is no unsolvable mystery, no problem without an answer, is to recognize the capacity for unlimited growth possible to each man. But growth is not automatic and inevitable. Until the desire for understanding is aroused, the will to carry on the search for truth remains dormant or weak. The vigor and challenge found in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky are often just what is required to change passive acceptance of "self-evident" truths into positive, creative activity.

Ideally, the Theosophist never ceases to be a student. First, because the literature offers an unending source for study, covering as it does writings, both ancient and modern, directed to the intellectual, moral, and spiritual nature of man. Also, another aspect of the learning-process is a function of the student of Theosophy—the necessity to phrase one's understanding of the teachings in

various forms of expression, depending on an intuitive grasp of the needs of enquirers. Frequent opportunity is given in the study classes for the basic ideas of Theosophy to be re-formulated in the student's own words.

In an article "Of Studying Theosophy" (THEOSOPHY 29:10), Mr. Judge viewed the theosophical scene of his day, and made some suggestions for improving it. He said:

> What is study? It is not the mere reading of books, but rather long, earnest, careful thought upon that which we have taken up. If a student accepts reincarnation and karma as true doctrines, the work is but begun. Many theosophists accept doctrines of that name, but are not able to say what it is they have accepted. They do not pause to find out what reincarnates, or how, when, or why karma has its effects, and often do not know what the word means. Some at first think that when they die they will reincarnate, without reflecting that it is the lower personal I they mean, which cannot be born again in a body. Others think that karma is—well, karma, with no clear idea of classes of karma, or whether or not it is punishment or reward or both. Hence a careful learning from one or two books of the statement of the doctrines, and then a more careful study of them, are absolutely necessary. There is too little of such right study among theosophists. . . .

This study helps us see how the same word may shift its meaning in different contexts, and how different words may often express similiar ideas. Only this kind of study can draw us toward the heights of thought and depths of meaning that the printed words suggest. Such study becomes a search—a search for wisdom.

How to start? Once again, Mr. Judge's advice proves helpful:

> Desire wisdom; love all men; do your duty; forget yourself; let each thought and act of your life have for its aim the finding of divine wisdom; strive to apply that wisdom for the good of other men. If you search in every direction, Light must come to you. Let the place in which you now are be the lonely room you speak of, and seek to find in everything the meaning. Strive to know what they are, and by what governed or caused. This is the first step. Live your life with this ever before you. Purify your thought as well as your body. Reason all you can, feel all with your heart you may, and when intellect and heart fail you, seek for something higher. This is the A.B.C.; it is enough for the present.

THE WISDOM RELIGION

Church and Masonry I

IT is a matter of History—however unreliable the latter—for a number of facts preserved by ancient writers corroborate it, that Church Ritualism and Freemasonry have sprung from the same source, and developed hand in hand. But as Masonry, even with its errors and later innovations, was far nearer the truth than the Church, the latter began very soon her persecutions against it. Masonry was, in its origin, simply archaic Gnosticism, or early esoteric Christianity; Church Ritualism was, and *is, exoteric paganism,* pure and simple—*remodelled,* we do not say *reformed.* Read the works of Ragon, a Mason who forgot more than the Masons of today know. Study, collating them together, the casual but numerous statements made by Greek and Latin writers, many of whom were Initiates, most learned Neophytes and partakers of the Mysteries. Read carefully the elaborate and venomous slanders of the Church Fathers against the Gnostics, the Mysteries and their Initiates—and you may end by unravelling the truth. It is a few philosophers who, driven by the political events of the day, tracked and persecuted by the fanatical Bishops of early Christianity—who had yet neither fixed ritual nor dogmas nor Church—it is these Pagans who founded the latter. Blending most ingeniously the truths of the Wisdom-religion with the exoteric fictions so dear to the ignorant mobs, it is they who laid the first foundations of ritualistic Churches and of the Lodges of modern Masonry. The latter fact was demonstrated by Ragon in his Ante-Omniae of the modern Liturgy compared with the ancient Mysteries, and showing the rituals conducted by the early Masons; the former may be ascertained by a like comparison of the Church canonicals, the sacred vessels, and the festivals of the Latin and other Churches, with those of the pagan nations. But Churches and Masonry have widely diverged since the days when both were one. If asked how a profane can know it, the an-

---

Note.—This series began in the November, 1966, issue. The section on Church and Masonry (here printed in two parts) is taken from H. P. Blavatsky's article "The Roots of Ritualism in Church and Masonry," last reprinted in Theosophy 45. Material used in this article may be found on pages 159-165.

swer comes: ancient and modern Freemasonry are an obligatory study with every Eastern Occultist.

Masonry, its paraphernalia and modern innovations (the Biblical Spirit in it especially) notwithstanding, does good both on the moral and physical planes—or did so, hardly ten years ago, at any rate.[1] It was a true *ecclesia* in the sense of fraternal union and mutual help, the only *religion* in the world, if we regard the term as derived from the word *religare,* "to bind" together, as it made all men belonging to it "brothers"—regardless of *race* and *faith*. Whether with the enormous wealth at its command it could not do far more than it does now, is no business of ours. We see no visible, crying evil from this institution, and no one yet, save the Roman Church, has ever been found to show that it did any harm. Can *Church* Christianity say as much? Let ecclesiastical and profane history answer the question. For one, it has divided the whole mankind into Cains and Abels; it has slaughtered millions in the name of her God—the Lord of *Hosts,* truly, the ferocious Jehovah Sabbaoth—and instead of giving an impetus to civilization, the favorite boast of her followers—it has retarded it during the long and weary Mediæval ages. It is only under the relentless assaults of science and the revolt of men trying to free themselves, that it began to lose ground and could no longer arrest enlightenment. Yet has it not softened, as claimed, the barbarous spirit of Heathendom"? We say no, most emphatically. It is Churchianity with its *odium theologicum,* since it could no longer repress human progress, which infused its lethal spirit of intolerance, its ferocious selfishness, greediness, and cruelty into modern civilization under the mask of *cant* and meek Christianity. When were the Pagan Cæsars more bloodthirsty or more coolly cruel than are the modern Potentates and their armies? When did the millions of the Proletariat starve as they do now? When has mankind shed more tears and suffered than at present?

Yes; there was a day when the Church and Masonry were one. These were centuries of intense moral reaction, a transitional period of thought as heavy as a nightmare, an age of strife. Thus, when the creation of new ideals led to the apparent pulling down of the old fanes and the destruction of old idols, it ended in reality

[1] Since the origin of Masonry, the split between the British and American Masons and the French "Grand Orient" of the "Widow's Sons" is the first one that has ever occurred. It bids fair to make of these two sections of Masonry a Masonic Protestant and a Roman Catholic Church, as far as regards ritualism and brotherly love, at all events.

with the rebuilding of those temples out of old materials, and the erection of the same idols under new names. It was a universal rearrangement and whitewashing—but only skin deep. History will never be able to tell us—but tradition and judicious research do—how many semi-Hierophants and even high Initiates were forced to become renegades in order to ensure the survival of the secrets of Initiation. Prætextatus, pro-consul at Achaia, is credited with remarking in the fourth century of our era, that "to deprive the Greeks of the sacred mysteries *which bind together the whole mankind* was equivalent to depriving them of their life." The Initiates took perhaps the hint, and thus joining *nolens volens* the followers of the new faith, then becoming all domineering, acted accordingly. Some hellenized Jewish Gnostics did the same; and thus more than one "Clemens Alexandrinus"—a convert to all appearance, an ardent Neo-Platonist and the same philosophical *pagan* at heart—became the instructor of ignorant Christian Bishops. In short the convert *malgré lui* blended the two external mythologies, the old and the new, and while giving out the compound to the masses, kept the sacred truths for himself.

The kind of Christians they made may be inferred from the example of Synesius, the Neo-Platonist. What scholar is ignorant of the fact, or would presume to deny, that the favourite and devoted pupil of Hypatia—the virgin-philosopher, the martyr and victim of the infamous Cyril of Alexandria—had not even been baptised when first offered by the bishops of Egypt the Episcopalian See of the Ptolemaïd? Every student is aware that, when finally baptised, after having accepted the office proffered, it was so *skin-deep* that he actually signed his consent only after his conditions had been complied with and his future privileges guaranteed. What the chief clause was, is curious. It was a *sine qua non* condition that he was to be allowed to abstain from professing the (Christian) doctrines, that he, the new Bishop did not believe in! Thus, although baptised and ordained in the degrees of deaconship, priesthood, and episcopate, he never separated himself from his wife, never gave up his Platonic philosophy, nor even his sport so strictly forbidden to every other bishop. This occurred as late as the fifth century.

Such transactions between initiated philosophers and ignorant priests of reformed Judaism were numerous in those days. The former sought to save their "mystery-vows" and personal dignity, and to do so they had to resort to a much-to-be-regretted compromise

with ambition, ignorance, and the rising wave of popular fanaticism. They believed in Divine Unity, the ONE or *Solus,* unconditioned and unknowable; and still they consented to render public homage and pay reverence to *Sol,* the Sun moving among his twelve apostles, the twelve signs of the Zodiac, *alias* the twelve Sons of Jacob. The *hoi polloi* remaining ignorant of the former, worshipped the latter, and in them, their old time-honoured gods. To transfer that worship from the solar-lunar and other cosmic deities to the Thrones, Archangels, Dominions, and Saints was no difficult matter; the more so since the said sidereal dignities were received into the new Christian Canon with their old names almost unchanged. Thus, while, during Mass, the "Grand Elect" reiterated, under his breath, his absolute adherence to the Supreme Universal Unity of the "incomprehensible Workman," and pronounced in solemn and loud tones the "Sacred Word" (now substituted by the Masonic "Word at low breath"), his assistant proceeded with the chanting of the *Kyriel* of names of those inferior sidereal beings whom the masses were made to worship. To the profane catechumen, indeed, who had offered prayers but a few months or weeks before to the Bull Apis and the holy Cynocephalus, to the sacred ibis and the hawk-headed Osiris, St. John's eagle[2] and the divine Dove (witness of the Baptism while hovering over the Lamb of God), must have appeared as the most natural development and sequence to his own national and sacred zoology, which he had been taught to worship since the day of his birth.

It may thus be shown that both modern Freemasonry and Church

[2] It is an error to say that John the Evangelist became the patron Saint of Masonry only after the sixteenth century, and it implies a double mistake. Between John the "Divine," the "Seer" and the writer of *Revelation*, and John the Evangelist who is now shown in the company of the Eagle, there is a great difference, as the latter John is a creation of Irenæus, along with the fourth gospel. Both were the result of the quarrel of the Bishop of Lyons with the Gnostics, and no one will ever tell what was the real name of the writer of the grandest of the Evangels. But what we do know is, that the Eagle is the legal property of John, the author of the Apocalypsis, written originally centuries before Christ, and only *re-edited*, before receiving canonical hospitality. This John or *Oannes*, was the accepted patron of all the Egyptian and Greek Gnostics (who were the early Builders or *Masons* of "Solomon's Temple," as, earlier, of the Pyramids) from the beginning of time. The *Eagle* was his attribute, the most archaic of symbols—being the Egyptian *Ah*, the bird of Zeus, and sacred to the Sun with every ancient people. Even the Jews adopted it among the Initiated Kabalists, as "the symbol of the Sephirah Tiph-e-reth, the spiritual Æther or air," says Mr. Myer's "Qabbalah." With the Druids the eagle was the symbol of the Supreme Deity, and again a portion of the cherubic symbol. Adopted by the pre-Christian Gnostics, it could be seen at the foot of the *Tau* in Egypt, before it was placed in the Rose-Croix degree at the foot of the Christian cross. Pre-eminently the bird of the Sun, the Eagle is necessarily connected with every solar god, and is the symbol of every seer who looks into the astral light, and sees in it the shadows of the Past, Present, and Future, as easily as the Eagle looks at the Sun.

ritualism descended in direct line from initiated Gnostics, Neo-Platonists, and renegade Hierophants of the Pagan Mysteries, the secrets of which they have lost, but which have been nevertheless preserved by those who would not compromise. If both Church and Masons are willing to forget the history of their true origin, the theosophists are not. They repeat: Masonry and the three great Christian religions are all inherited goods. The "ceremonies and passwords" of the former, and the prayers, dogmas, and rites of the latter, are travestied copies of pure Paganism (copied and borrowed as diligently by the Jews), and of Neo-Platonic theosophy. Also, that the "passwords" used even now by Biblical Masons and connected with "the tribe of Judah," "Tubal-Cain," and other Zodiacal dignitaries of the Old Testament, are the Jewish *aliases* of the ancient gods of the heathen *mobs,* not of the Hierogrammatists, the interpreters of the *true* mysteries. That which follows proves it well. The good Masonic Brethren could hardly deny that in name they are *Solicoles* indeed, the worshippers of the Sun in heaven, in whom the erudite Ragon saw such a magnificent symbol of the G.A.O.T.U.—which it surely is. Only the trouble he had was to prove—which no one can—that the said G.A.O.T.U. was not rather the *Sol* of the small exoteric fry of the *Pro-fanes* than the *Solus* of the High *Epoptai.* For the secret of the fires of SOLUS, the spirit of which radiates in the "Blazing Star," is a Hermetic secret which, unless a Mason studies *true* theosophy, is lost to him for ever. He has ceased to understand now, even the little indiscretions of Tshuddi. To this day Masons and Christians keep the Sabbath sacred, and call it the "Lord's" day; yet they know as well as any that both *Sunday,* and the *Sonntag* of Protestant England and Germany, mean the Sun-day or the *day of the Sun,* as it meant 2,000 years ago.

And you, Reverend and good Fathers, Priests, Clergymen, and Bishops, you who so charitably call theosophy "idolatry" and doom its adherents openly and privately to eternal perdition, can you boast of one single rite, vestment, or sacred vessel in church or temple that does not come to you from paganism? Nay, to assert it would be too dangerous, in view, not only of history, but also of the confessions of your own priestly craft.

Let us recapitulate if only to justify our assertions.

"Roman sacrificators had to confess before sacrificing," writes du Choul. The priests of Jupiter donned a tall, square, black cap

(*Vide* Armenian and Greek modern priests), the head dress of the *Flamines*. The black *soutane* of the Roman Catholic priest is the black *hierocoraces*, the loose robe of the Mithraic priests, so-called from being *raven* coloured (raven, *corax*). The King-Priest of Babylon had a golden seal-ring and slippers kissed by the conquered potentates, a white mantle, a tiara of gold, to which two bandelets were suspended. The popes have the seal-ring and the slippers for the same use; a white satin mantle bordered with golden stars, a tiara with two bejewelled bandelets suspended to it, etc., etc. The white linen *alb* (*alba vestis*) is the garment of the priests of *Isis;* the top of the heads of the priests of Anubis was shaven (*Juvenal*), hence the tonsure; the *chasuble* of the Christian *"Father"* is the copy from the upper garment of the Phœnician priest-sacrificers, a garment called *calasiris*, tied at the neck and descending to their *heels*. The *stole* comes to our priests from the female garment worn by the *Galli*, the male—*Nautches* of the temple, whose office was that of the Jewish *Kadashim;* (*Vide* II Kings 23:7, for the true word) their *belt of purity* (?) from the *ephod* of the Jews, and the *Isiac* cord; the priests of Isis being vowed to chastity. (*Vide* Ragon, for details.)

The ancient pagans used *holy* water or lustrations to purify their cities, fields, temples, and men, just as it is being done now in Roman Catholic countries. Fonts stood at the door of every temple, full of lustral water and called *favisses* and *aquiminaria*. Before sacrificing, the pontiff or the *curion* (whence the French *curé*), dipping a laurel branch into the lustral water, sprinkled with it the pious congregation assembled, and that which was then termed *lustrica* and *aspergilium* is now called sprinkler (or *goupillon*, in French). The latter was with the priestesses of Mithra the symbol of the Universal *lingam*. Dipped during the Mysteries in lustral milk, the faithful were sprinkled with it. It was the emblem of Universal fecundity; hence the use of the holy water in Christianity, a rite of phallic origin. More than this; the idea underlying it is purely occult and belongs to ceremonial magic. Lustrations were performed by fire, sulphur, air, and water. To draw the attention of the celestial gods, *ablutions* were resorted to; to conjure the nether gods away, *aspersion* was used.

The vaulted ceilings of cathedrals and churches, Greek or Latin, are often painted blue and studded with golden stars, to represent the canopy of the heavens. This is copied from the Egyptian temples, where solar and star worship was performed. Again, the same reverence is paid in Christian and Masonic architecture to the Orient (or the Eastern point) as in the days of Paganism. Ragon described

it fully in his destroyed volumes. The *princeps porta,* the door of the world, and of the "King of Glory," by whom was meant at first the Sun, and now his human symbol, the Christ, is the door of the Orient, and faces the East in every church and temple.[3] It is through this "door of life"—the solemn pathway, through which the daily entrance of the luminary into the *oblong square*[4] of the earth or the Tabernacle of the Sun is effected every morning—that the "newly born" babe is ushered, and carried to the baptismal font; and it is to the left of this edifice (the gloomy north whither start the "apprentices," and where the candidates got their *trial by water*) that now the fonts, and in the days of old the well (*piscinas*) of lustral waters, were placed in the ancient churches, which had been pagan fanes. The altars of heathen Lutetia were buried, and found again under the choir of *Notre-Dame* of Paris, its ancient lustral wells existing to this day in the said Church. Almost every great ancient Church on the Continent that antedates the Middle Ages was once a pagan temple in virtue of the orders issued by the Bishops and Popes of Rome. Gregory the Great (Platine *en sa Vie*) commands the monk Augustine, his missionary in England, in this wise: "Destroy the idols, never the temples! Sprinkle them with holy water, place in them relics, and let the nations worship in the places they are accustomed to." We have but to turn to the works of Cardinal Baronius, to find in the year thirty-sixth of his *Annals* his confession. The Holy Church, he says, was *permitted to appropriate the rites and ceremonies used by the pagans in their idolatrous cult,* since she (the Church) *expiated them by her consecration!* In the *Antiquités Gauloises* (Book II, Ch. 19) by Fauchet, we read that the Bishops of France adopted and *used the pagan ceremonies in order to convert followers to Christ.*

This was when Gaul was still a pagan country. Are the same rites and ceremonies used now in Christian France, and other Roman Catholic countries, still going on in grateful remembrance of the pagans and their gods?

---

[3] Except, perhaps, the temples and chapels of dissident Protestants, which are built anywhere, and used for more than one purpose.

[4] A Masonic term; a symbol of the Arks of Noah, and of the Covenant, of the Temple of Solomon, the Tabernacle, and the Camp of the Israelites, all built as "oblong squares." Mercury and Apollo were represented by oblong cubes and squares, and so is Kaaba, the great temple at Mecca.

THE HEAVEN-BORN KNOWLEDGE

THERE is a theme running throughout the Theosophical teachings which bears the impress of their high origins. It calls the student to awareness of the reality of spiritual planes and the level of being to which the divine in all men aspires. And, together with the declaration of truths which may be inwardly discerned, there is the warning that this development is accomplished only by heroic effort. Compromise and complacency have no part in the life of the warrior soul.

Various passages in the writings of the Founders, and in more ancient expositions, give these ideas an unmistakable priority in relation to the work and mood of the disciple life. Always the stress is on the effort required, and on the subtle resources which may be availed of in the struggle.

In *Isis Unveiled,* H.P.B. draws on Sergeant Cox, a Spiritualist writer, for insight into the obstacles which beset the work of finding and promulgating truth in this epoch. "We cannot," she says, "help admiring once more the profound knowledge of human nature which dictated to Mr. Sergeant Cox the following":

> There is no more fatal fallacy than that the truth will prevail by its own force, that it has only to be seen to be embraced. In fact the desire for the actual truth exists in very few minds, and the capacity to discern it in fewer still. When men say that they are seeking the truth, they mean that they are looking for evidence to support some prejudice or prepossession. Their beliefs are moulded to their wishes. They see all, and more than all, that seems to tell for that which they desire; they are blind as bats to whatever tells against them. The scientists are no more exempt from this common failing than are others. (*Isis Unveiled* I, 615.)

We see here why cleaving to the teacher is so crucial in a search for truth, for the Teacher's attunement to the OVERSOUL affords a magnetic field which helps to displace the blinding tendencies of the as yet unpurified lower *manas*. Since truth is not to be found in the midst of passion and desire, or in the confusions of the transient and the visible, a bridge is needed to lead away from these conditions of almost unconscious preconception.

A heaven-born Wisdom is given us by the agency and sacrifice of H.P.B., which may inoculate against preconceptions which "fasten vampire-like on man's mind," enthralling the embodied *manas*. If making philosophy "second-nature to ourselves" requires—as a first step—that we replace our present "network of associations" with this philosophy, then we can see what mental labor there is before us. And we know that learning divorced from service and recognition of the oneness of life is even worse than the vacancy of an undeveloped mind—of which Porphyry remarked that it found "naught in stylae covered with inscriptions but stone, and in written books naught but the tissue of the papyrus." Wisdom sweeps away the first of these conditions as surely as it cures the last, and leads us on to the vision of Pymander:

> The things of earth are not the TRUTH. . . . Death, for some persons, is an evil which strikes them with profound terror. This is ignorance. . . . Death is the destruction of the body; the being in it dies not. . . . The material body loses its form, which is disintegrated in course of time; the senses which animated it return to their source and resume their functions; but they gradually lose their passions and their desires, and *the spirit* ascends to heaven to become a HARMONY. In the first zone, it leaves behind itself the faculty of increasing and decreasing; in the second, the power of doing evil and the frauds of idleness; in the third, the deceptions and concupiscence; in the fourth, insatiable ambition; in the fifth, arrogance, audacity, and temerity; in the sixth, all yearning after dishonest acquisitions; and in the seventh, *untruthfulness*. The spirit thus purified by the effect in him of the celestial harmonies, returns once more to its primitive state, strong of a merit and power self-acquired, and which belongs to it properly. . . . He is become a GOD! . . . No, the things of earth are not the truth. (*Isis* I, 625.)

Truth, it may be, derives from the capacity to recognize unities, whether in the sphere revealed by our eyesight, or of the mind, or of the entire planet. That is, each environment we work in, corresponding to the focus in ourselves which makes perception possible, may be a kind of "way station" on the path to truth. *The Voice of the Silence* says something akin to this:

> Thou hast to learn to part thy body from thy mind, to dissipate the shadow, and to live in the eternal. For this, thou hast to live and breathe in all, as *all that thou perceivest breathes in thee;* to feel thyself abiding in all things, all things in SELF.

If the lesson of singleness of aim and purpose is applied even in our physical body, it is likely that the subtle and mysterious law will

so work, too, in behalf of those bound together by their devotion to embody and promulgate a common philosophy. In the *Path* for May, 1886, Mr. Judge published a letter along this line. It came, he said, from a "Friend":

> It rejoices us all here, more than I can tell you, to know that you have made such a start in America with Theosophy. We have had so many things to pull us back that it has been quite as much as we could manage to keep our heads above water, and this not so much from the action of our enemies as from the apathy of our friends. It is strange to me to see how little faith there is in the power of truth, even among those who ought to realize this most strongly. Why should we fear and fold our hands when men speak evil of us or of the cause? Why should we imagine that any attack on individual members can affect the position we take as a group or that Theosophy can be endangered thereby? How few understand what Theosophy is! They look upon it as solely an intellectual movement that can be damned by the folly of its adherents; they little dream of the strength that underlies the apparently inconsistent workings of this manifestation of truth. . . .
>
> I yet believe that there is a power within it that will purge it from the defects and carry it on in spite of the attacks of its enemies and, what is worse still, the follies of its friends. What I do feel more and more is the necessity that we should remember and constantly keep before us what it is we are working for and not think we accomplish our end when we number our converts in the world of fashion. . . . What can be done to make men realize, as you say, a sense of universal brotherhood and the true meaning of Theosophy?

These truths rise far above what the churches and even the educational system esteem as knowledge.

on the lookout

Is Science Getting out of Hand?

In *Science and Survival* (Viking Press, 1966), Dr. Barry Commoner speaks of the successes of modern technological enterprises, which, he says, have been "magnificent," but many of them, he adds, have also had unforeseen results that were well-nigh disastrous—the contamination from nuclear fallout, pollution of air, water, and soil, etc. As an instance of how machines may work to defeat the very purpose for which they were constructed, he cites the failure of the electric power grid in the northeastern United States and Canada in 1965, and reminds us that six years before this happened, Dr. Norbert Wiener, of cybernetics and computer fame, had warned that it had become technically possible to build automatic machines that "most definitely escape the complete effective control of the man who has made them." Further—

> Dr. Wiener also warned us that such machines are not to be trusted. He suggested that if we build a machine and instruct it to win a war it may, like the New England power grid, do its duty in a completely unexpected way, and "win a nominal victory on points at the cost of every interest we have at heart, even that of national survival."

These technological "failures," says Dr. Commoner, were not the result of callous indifference, but of unchecked enthusiasm in solving problems in some specialized field without realizing their effect on the total environment. The only way to avoid this, in his opinion, is to make the results of *all* research immediately available to other scientists, *everywhere,* so that researchers in other fields may work on the same problem. Only so, he believes, can "science check itself." For had the detergents, pesticides, and mineral fertilizers that have caused so much damage been tested by ecologists, biochemists, molecular scientists, and others, they would never have been put on the market, and nuclear testing might have been more carefully controlled. But the pressures of industrial competition

and national (or political) expediency demanded "secrecy" on the part of their research teams, thus endangering "the very integrity of science."

Considerations such as these cause Dr. Commoner to ask: "Is it possible that we do not know the full consequences of the new power grids and the new bombs? Are we in control of the vast new powers that science has given us, or is there a danger that science is getting out of hand?"

Scientists and Social Responsibility

Dr. Commoner thinks scientists have a duty to inform the public, without reservations, of the possible, even *probable* results of any technological project, though they have no right to make value judgments as scientists. The issues—economic, industrial, social, political and national—are at root moral issues and should be decided by the entire citizenry. The problems are not simple, nor the solutions easy, as Dr. Commoner shows:

> The exercise of morality now requires the determination of rights between the farmers whose pesticides poison the water and the fishermen whose livelihood may thereby be destroyed. It calls for a judgment between the advantages of replacing a smoky urban power generator with a smokeless nuclear one which carries with it some hazard of a catastrophic accident. . . . And since the substance of science is still often poorly perceived by most citizens, the technical content of the issues of the modern world shields them from moral judgment.

Area of Greatest Danger

Only scientists, says Dr. Commoner, can fully understand the horrible results of nuclear war, and few of them have been willing to tell the complete story. For this reason—

> The self-destructiveness of nuclear war lies hidden behind a mask of science and technology. It is this shield, I believe, which has protected this most fateful issue in the history of man from the judgment of human morality. The greatest moral crime of our time is the concealment of the nature of nuclear war, for it deprives humanity of the solemn right to sit in judgment on its own fate: it condemns us all, unwittingly, to the greatest dereliction of conscience. . . . Science can now serve society by exposing the crisis of modern technology to the judgment of all mankind. Only this judgment can determine whether the knowledge that science has given us shall destroy humanity or advance the welfare of man.

Dr. Commoner also argues that if the United States and Russia would collaborate on the moon project, instead of making it a "race" to see who gets there first, the chances for the survival of the astronauts and their safe return would be more than doubled. It is clear that he considers the political emphasis on being *first* to be morally indefensible.

Nature's "Moral Law"

In reporting on the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, held early in January, Walter Sullivan began his column in *The New York Times* (Jan. 1) by saying:

> There is a peculiar morality in nature that forbids any species from long remaining dominant over all others. However one species—man—has made himself immune to that morality. The result is that the world's human population is doubling every few decades. Furthermore, since the first nuclear explosions at the end of World War II, we have been altering the environment of this planet at a rate catastrophic by nature's standards. Normally such changes take place at a sedate pace, measured in thousands or millions of years. . . .
>
> Furthermore the immunity of man to nature's "moral law" means that the world's population is growing towards the level where only calamitous events such as war, starvation, epidemic diseases, or epidemic neuroses can call a halt to the trend. The "morality" of nature is inherent in the process that we call evolution.

Man, of course, is *not* immune to nature's moral law; but in thinking himself to be, he has committed many crimes against nature, and is only now beginning to realize that in doing so he has acted against himself. Great concern was shown at the AAAS meeting over "man-made destruction"—particularly pollutants in air, water, and soil. One speaker remarked that "scientists are just beginning to understand the complex interdependence of organisms." Perhaps this is a step toward viewing nature as an "intelligent whole," and thus another instance of how "modern science is drawn more every day into the maëlstrom of Occultism."

"The Moral Sense of Scientists"

Under this title, an editorial in *Science* (Jan. 20) emphasized the tone of AAAS discussion. The topic, "How Man Has Changed His Planet," says the editorial, "provided for more than a take-off

point for bragging; it was a symptom of the unease that permeated the meeting." One speaker, for example, told his audience that the consequences of weather modification should be weighed before "we are called upon to deal with them." "The point is," he continued, "there is still time for reflective thought, for setting objectives, for weighing alternative courses of action—in short, to act responsibly."

Another topic that vied in popularity with that of pollution was ethnology—in particular, how "scientific inquiry would do least to feed the fires of racial animosity." One group held that differences between races should not be discussed at all; another, that inquiry should be continued, but that the nineteenth-century tag of "inferior," merely because different, should be denounced. "In our world," said one geneticist, "a scientist has no right to be irresponsible." And a historian observed that "both our present science and our present technology are so tinctured with Christian arrogance toward nature—the attitude that it exists for the service of man—that the remedy must also be essentially religious, [for] science and technology cannot answer all the questions they raise."

Theosophy provides this "religious" orientation—the sense of oneness that *binds all back* to one source. And there are many indications, tangential though they may be, that science is beginning to glimpse the possibility of the "radical unity of the ultimate essence of each constituent part of the compounds of nature . . . the one fundamental law in Occult Science." (*S.D.* I, 120.)

Science Moving Toward Philosophy?

In an address printed in the Spring *American Scholar*, Dr. Walter O. Roberts, of the University of Colorado, says more optimistically that "science, like music or fine art, is a wellspring of the divine discontent that stirs men to seek more of life than merely to eat and to sleep." Dr. Roberts also looks at the "two faces of science" and its ability to check itself, declaring that "science is constantly, systematically and inexorably revisionary. Science, by the rules of the game, is a self-correcting process and one that is self-destroying of its own errors." He detects a new dimension in contemporary science:

> To me, the true significance of the space age, this accelerating age of science and technology in which we now live, is that it is beginning to lead us to wonder, once again, about the nature

> and purpose of man, about what constitutes the good life and the good society. . . . Moreover, in today's world, concern over the nature and purpose of man need no longer be confined to a small elite with the leisure and the interest. Today it can become the domain of an ever-growing class of people who have the free time, the education and the material resources that are the inevitable products of space-age control of nature by reasonable men. Today science is a matter of concern to everybody. . . .

A Vision of the Future

Dr. Roberts enumerates the major achievements in science in recent years—plentiful food supply, mass education, leisure, etc., but adds:

> To bring to substance this great dream for humanity we must know that this is what we really want and be willing to work to achieve it. To a tragic degree we in the West have drifted, not so much for lack of willingness to pay the price, but for lack of knowing what it is that we have really wanted—aside from factories, and a rise in the standard of living. . . . We must exhibit a concern with philosophy that is geared to the chain-reacting growth of science, and that is consonant with the impact of science on man's changing conception of himself and his world. We must commit ourselves to dare to build the world we want, knowing that it is possible if we but demand it—and if we use intelligently all the potent forces of science, the arts and the humanities that are at our disposal.

There is a suppressed mournful note behind this promise of a material paradise inhabited by humanistically aware people—a note which gets no serious discussion. All that Dr. Roberts speaks of is indeed possible, but there is little or nothing in scientific doctrine to tell us *how* to "commit ourselves to dare to build the world we want" and to "use intelligently all the potent forces of science and the humanities that are at our disposal." Dr. Roberts seems really to be saying that we could do all these things if people would only be *different!*

New Conception of "Man" Needed

Few scientists address themselves directly to this problem of sustained motive. Few of any profession, save for a handful of pioneers, show recognition of the fact that the depressing conception that people have of themselves, and the distorting conception of their interest and welfare, are behind the apathy which stands in the way of intelligent use of the resources science places at our dis-

posal. Science has done little to provide an idea of the human being which leads naturally to responsibility, brotherliness, and altruistic work for others. On the contrary, the image of man constructed by science has been that of a late arrival in the line of animal evolution, with apish forebears, in whom the instincts of the brute take precedence over social ideals and for whom the struggle for survival supplies the principles of both individual and national policy. Without ever intending it, science has thus performed a vast indoctrination in the legitimacy of self-interest for human beings, with ethical ideas, when they are presented, coming only as after-thoughts born from the terrible consequences of behavior based on the law of the jungle. A science that will help to fulfill the hopes of Dr. Roberts will have to move from quite different assumptions about the nature of man.

"A Common Ancestry"

The rapid development of biology in the twentieth century goes far toward fulfilling one of the predictions made by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine*. "Chemistry and physiology," she says (I, 261), "are the two great magicians of the future, who are destined to open the eyes of mankind to the great physical truths." *Physical* truths are indeed contained in the article, "The Biologist in Space," by Colin S. Pittendrigh, of Princeton University, in the March *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*—truths pointing to the basic unity of all forms of life. While Darwin studied similarity of structure at the anatomical or macro-level, the discoveries of modern biochemistry have extended the knowledge of unity of structure to the micro-level. For example, a "common organization" has been found in the epithelia of daffodils, the muscles of men, and even in the one-celled runners of certain vines. And the same parallels exist at the molecular level: catalysis effected by similar protein enzymes, the same "transport systems," identical enzymatic co-factors, and "hereditary information stored and replicated by a system of nucleic acids." Thus—

> The limited patterns which Darwin could see binding genera, families, orders, classes, and phyla of organisms are themselves subsumed under a still more general pattern of cellular structures and chemical constitution that binds all life on this planet into a common family, descendants of a common ancestry.
>
> Darwin clearly glimpsed the potential extension of his evolutionary ideas to embrace the origin of life from the nonliving world. . . .

In the Beginning

In considering the origin of life on this planet, it must be kept in mind that the earth itself has undergone change and development —"evolution of a sort," Dr. Pittendrigh puts it. The chemistry of the crust and atmosphere have changed so that although "spontaneous generation" is no longer in evidence, there was a time when, as H.P.B. says, "it was in full swing in the genesis of terrestrial life." Dr. Pittendrigh proposes that the absence, or extreme scarcity, of water permitted the formation of simple carbohydrates, amino acids, and other organic units characteristic of the cell, and these could have been concentrated in one way or another on clays. He continues:

> At any rate there was a historical opportunity in the course of the earth's early development in which sufficiently complex molecules had accumulated in local concentration to the point where a particular organization of them could occur "spontaneously" and was of such a nature that it could replicate itself from molecular constituents in the surrounding milieu.
>
> This primeval "spontaneous generation" . . . was contingent on the unique historical sequence of conditions prevailing then but not now: the reducing atmosphere, the availability of an energy source, and especially the sterility of bodies of water.
>
> The first self-replicating systems of molecules must have utilized, as building blocks and as a source of energy, the organic units previously synthesized abiologically. . . .

A Biologist Speculates

Because of the lack of oxygen, says Dr. Pittendrigh, the first organisms were doubtless anaerobic—such as bacteria. (An important footnote on anaerobes may be found in *The Secret Doctrine* I, 249.) These anaerobes must subsequently have developed organisms capable of making their own food, and "with the biochemical competence, first, to synthesize the building blocks themselves from small molecules in the environment, and, second, to exploit radiant energy systematically for such synthesis." This "secondary evolution" produced the oxygen that was needed for the development of organisms with aerobic respiratory mechanisms. Dr. Pittendrigh then suggests that certain "distinct structural entities of cells" *could* be the "evolved descendants" of these primitive organisms. He argues, therefore, that—

> The living thing is made from the stuff of the nonliving world. It involves no qualitative novelty, no *élan vital*: it differs from

> the nonliving only in its complexity and organization. The organization of its molecular constituents confers on the system, as such, those properties we recognize as "life."

So Near, and Yet So Far

This makes, Dr. Pittendrigh thinks, "the final link in the chain of scientific ideas underlying a philosophic naturalism: the unitary treatment of all nature without recourse to supernatural or occult forces."

While Theosophists will agree that supernatural forces are not involved, what could be more "occult" than the systematic progression from unity to heterogeneity, from simple to complex, from autotrophic and anaerobic to heterotrophic and aerobic organisms—in short, from molecule to man? And as for there being no *élan vital*—that creative force within an organism which builds physical form and produces necessary or desirable adaptations—every fact brought out by Dr. Pittendrigh seems to suggest that there *is* a creative intelligence, a life-force pushing the inorganic toward organic expression. (H.P.B. calls it "the immortal spirit, whose reflection is connected by invisible links even with inorganic matter.")

Beyond the Test Tube

By showing that identical chemical constituents with identical functions run the gamut from infusoria to man, biochemists have come close to substantiating the occult teaching, which is, according to *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 261):

> Not only the chemical compounds are the same, but the same infinitesimal *invisible lives* compose the atoms of the bodies of the mountain and the daisy, of man and the ant, of the elephant, and of the tree which shelters him from the sun. Each particle —whether you call it organic or inorganic is a life. Every atom and molecule in the Universe is both *life-giving* and *death-giving* to that form, inasmuch as it builds by aggregation universes and the ephemeral vehicles ready to receive the transmigrating soul, and as eternally destroys and changes the forms and expells those souls from their temporary abodes. . . . It is that mysterious LIFE, represented collectively by countless myriads of lives, that follows in its own sporadic way, the hitherto incomprehensible law of Atavism. . . .